13:12:40

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.,)

Plaintiff,

C.A. No. 18-2033-RGA

V.

CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

et al.,

Defendants.

Wednesday, February 19, 2020 3:30 p.m. Conference

844 King Street Wilmington, Delaware

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE RICHARD G. ANDREWS
United States District Court Judge

APPEARANCES:

POLSINELLI PC

BY: CHRISTINA BELITZ VAVALA, ESQ.

BY: STEPHEN KRAFTSCHIK, ESQ.

-and-

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON

BY: RYAN J. SCHLETZBAUM, ESQ.

Counsel for the Plaintiff

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	
3	RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER, PA
4	BY: KELLY E. FARNAN, ESQ.
5	-and-
6	COOLEY LLP BY: DAVID EISEMAN, ESQ.
7	Counsel for the Defendants
8	Counsel for the Defendants
9	
10	- 000 -
11	PROCEEDINGS
12	(REPORTER'S NOTE: The following conference was held
13	in chambers, beginning at 3:30 p.m.)
14	
15	
15:26:5316	
15:32:1217	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.
15:32:2218	So this is a discovery matter in Sprint versus
15:32:2519	Charter, Civil Action Number 18-2033. So for plaintiff,
15:32:3520	Mr. Kraftschik, Ms. Vavala, and so Mr. Kraftschik, are you
15:32:4221	now in the same firm as Ms. Vavala?
15:32:4522	MR. KRAFTSCHIK: I am. As of three days ago, I
15:32:5023	am at Polsinelli.
15:32:5&4	THE COURT: Off the record.
15:33:0025	(Discussion off the record.)

15:33:02 1	THE COURT: Who do you have with you here?
15:33:08 2	MS. VAVALA: Mr. Ryan Schletzbaum from Shook,
15:33:12 3	Hardy & Bacon.
15:33:12 4	THE COURT: I have seen Mr. Schletzbaum a few
15:33:14 5	times before.
15:33:14 6	And Ms. Farnan, you're still with Richards?
15:33:17 7	MS. FARNAN: Yes, Your Honor, as far as I know.
15:33:20 8	THE COURT: I don't know anything.
15:33:21 9	All right. Who do you have with you here?
15:33:2310	MS. FARNAN: David Eiseman from Quinn Emanuel.
15:33:2611	MR. EISEMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
15:33:2712	THE COURT: All right. So I read these letters
15:33:2913	and I think I know what I want to do which is it seems to me
15:33:3314	that the parties negotiated ten custodians and it turned out
15:33:4515	that Sprint only has five. And you know, I think that's
15:33:5216	maybe something that should have been disclosed while you
15:33:5517	were negotiating. So what I propose is Charter only needs
15:33:5918	to do five. Have you already named ten or what have you
15:34:0219	done so far?
15:34:0320	MR. EISEMAN: We have named ten, Your Honor.
15:34:0521	THE COURT: So you get to pick which five, so
15:34:0722	you can pick whichever ones seem like the most fruitful.
15:34:1223	MR. SCHLETZBAUM: Of the current list, or any
15:34:1424	five we choose?
15:34:1525	THE COURT: I assume the current list because

isn't the current list -- I mean, you know who is on the current list and why -- yeah, yeah, now that I'm thinking about it, yeah, from the current list. MR. SCHLETZBAUM: The reason I asked, you may

have saw this in our proposal, the compromise to avoid the hearing altogether was to agree to the five limit if you would include among those five a custodian who had information relative to willfulness.

THE COURT: Yes, when you said that, I was thinking there is something up here and you're talking about the in-house counsel that people have been arguing over and over again.

MR. SCHLETZBAUM: Not just in-house counsel, that was two examples that we identified as someone that we knew or suspected knowledge of willfulness. But anybody else -- we would certainly prefer to have Mr. Abramov. If there is another witness that they can include that has evidence of willfulness, we would be happy with that, and we would need a technical witness and on their list there is ten technical witnesses as we understand it.

THE COURT: Right. And just remind me in terms of a willfulness witness so to speak, you just don't have one or what?

MR. EISEMAN: We don't, Your Honor. You know, we're not going to resist willfulness discovery. They can

15:34:18 1 15:34:20 2 15:34:23 3 15:34:25 4 15:34:27 5 15:34:31 6 15:34:34 7 15:34:37 8 15:34:39 9 15:34:4210 15:34:4411 15:34:4712 15:34:4713 15:34:4914 15:34:5215 15:34:5516 15:34:5917

15:35:0418

15:35:020

15:35:049

15:35:1021 15:35:1322

15:35:123 15:35:1724

15:35:1925

15:35:22 1 get it through document request and interrogatories, but in 15:35:26 2 terms of there were no subject matter requirements for who or what type of custodian should be picked, so we picked the 15:35:29 3 five or now ten, ten and now five that we thought had the 15:35:32 4 most discoverable information. None of them are willfulness 15:35:35 5 witnesses, but we're not going to deny them the opportunity 15:35:42 6 15:35:45 7 to take depositions on the issue. 15:35:47 8 THE COURT: Is there somebody in particular 15:35:51 9 other than Abramov who is somebody you think who is out 15:35:5210 there who has this information?

MR. SCHLETZBAUM: We know Mr. Abramov had some unique deals with Sprint in both these patents and the patents in the related cases and I appreciate the representation that they're not going to deny us that discovery in document request through related cases. We're still trying to get that information through whatever procedure and mechanism we can. And I don't want to argue that here today.

THE COURT: Good idea.

15:35:5511

15:35:5712

15:35:5913

15:36:0214

15:36:0415

15:36:0716

15:36:117

15:36:1418

15:36:1419

15:36:1520

15:36:1721

15:36:1922

15:36:2423

15:36:2524

15:36:2725

MR. SCHLETZBAUM: I don't have somebody in mind other than Mr. Abramov. I'm not privy to their inner-workings or who would be aware of Sprint's inner-workings.

THE COURT: So lets do this, they named ten technical people, pick five, they can do the five.

15:36:29 1 15:36:37 2 15:36:43 3 15:36:47 4 15:36:53 5 15:36:56 6 15:37:03 7 15:37:07 8 15:37:08 9 15:37:1010 15:37:1311 15:37:1612 15:37:1613 15:37:2014 15:37:2415

15:37:2816

15:37:3317

15:37:3618

15:37:4519

15:37:4920

15:37:5421

15:37:5822

15:38:0023

15:38:0124

15:38:0325

Somewhere down the line if you develop somebody other than Abramov as somebody who is, you know, still there and particularly good on willfulness, and it kind of strikes me that you probably won't just because it seems if I'm not confusing it with something else, part of the reason is because there have been prior discussions, right, this whole point of Abramov was he was involved in negotiating things back in the day.

MR. SCHLETZBAUM: Yes, he had interactions with Sprint's in-house counsel pre-suit about the patents and also was aware of Sprint's enforcement efforts in other cases.

THE COURT: Right. And I think maybe I saw this in here, you know who you dealt with, if there was somebody else besides Abramov, maybe there wasn't, so presumably if you actually had -- maybe you only dealt with him which is why you don't have another name to suggest. But when you get your hands on the paper discovery, you know, if it -- if something has come up that makes it appear somehow you have been hoodwinked here, which I doubt that it will, see if you can't figure out some remedy between yourself and if not, come back, remind me that I said this. Okay?

MR. SCHLETZBAUM: Very good.

THE COURT: Because otherwise I will forget.

All right. So you have the ten names. Can you pick your

7

15:38:08 1	five custodians and how long will it take you to do that?
15:38:12 2	MR. SCHLETZBAUM: A couple days I would imagine.
15:38:14 3	THE COURT: Why don't you do it by the end of
15:38:16 4	next week. Alright?
15:38:17 5	MR. EISEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
15:38:18 6	THE COURT: Sorry to make you come here. I
15:38:21 7	don't know why I read this over the weekend and, you know,
15:38:26 8	didn't crystalize in my mind until very recently what I
15:38:30 9	thought I should be doing here.
10	(Conference concluded at 3:38 p.m.)
11	
12	I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and
13	accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding
14	/s/ Dale C. Hawkins
15	Official Court Reporter U.S. District Court
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	